Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/565,680	TAKAGI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SAEED M. HUDA	1742
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>SAEED M. HUDA</u> .	(3)	
(2) Attny Kevin McKinley.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 20 October 2010	Time: <u>1:00 PM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: n/a		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: see continuation shee		
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
/SAEED M. HUDA/ Examiner, Art Unit 1742	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Ex indicated claim 13 could be allowed if the claim language in the newly amended portion of the claim were altered. The Ex indicated that there was no explicit support, in the specification, for the phrase "providing a single centering shaft independently of the pair of bladder operating sleeves". Additionally, the Examiner indicated that it was contradictory to state that the shaft is independent of the bladder operating sleeves and to indicate that the shaft displaces the sleeves.

The Ex also indicated that the word "minutely" and "minute" found in the newly amended claim language was ambiguous and that correction was required.

The Ex indicated that it might be appropriate to alter the phrase "when inserted into the pair of bladder operating sleeves" to state "when said single centering shaft is inserted into the pair of bladder operating sleeves" to allow the reader to properly identify the component interaction.

Attny agreed to the correction of claim 13 and has cancelled the withdrawn claims, claims 15-22